AN

APOLOGY

FOR THE

Engliſh Presbyterians,

WITH A

DEFENCE

OF THE

Heads of Agreement

Aſſented to by the *United Miniſters*, in the Year 91.

LONDON,

Printed, and are to be Sold by the Bookſellers of *London* and *Weſtminſter*, 1699.

XUM

XUM

TO THE READER.

IN *the Reigns of Queen* Elizabeth, *and* James *the* First, *the* Englisſh Presbyterians *were repreſented to be for ſuch a* Church-Government *as was Inconſiſtent with, and Deſtructive of the King's Supremacy in Matters Eccleſiaſtical, as well as of the* Dioceſan *Form. And that the* Civil Magiſtrate *might be induc'd to Believe it, Three Articles were propoſed to be Subſcribed unto; the* First *about the* Supremacy, *the other* Two *about the* Government, Liturgy, *and* Ceremonies *of the Church; whereupon they, who refuſed Subſcription only to the* Second *and* Third, *were ſaid to do ſo, becauſe they would not Allow of the* First.

This Accuſation *was the more generally Receiv'd, becauſe the* Engliſh Presbyterians *Correſponded with their Brethren in* Scotland, *(who deny the* Supremacy*) about Epiſcopacy, the Liturgy, and the Ceremonies; and among the* Conforming Clergy, *there were ſome, who would have introduced the* Claſſical *Government,*

under the Name *of* Dioceſan ; *which moved Archbiſhop* Bancroft *to Publiſh his* Scotizing Dangerous Poſitions and Survey. *Beſides the* Claſſical *National Government being founded on a* Divine Right, *was the more frightful to the* Queen, *her Nobility and Gentry, who would never ſuffer the Divine Right of the* Dioceſan *Government ; knowing that the Divine Right of a National Church Government of any ſort, and the* Regal *Supremacy can never* ſimul & ſemel *dwell in the ſame Kingdom, the* Setting *up of the* One, *being a* Subverſion of the other.

The Engliſh Presbyterians, *Obſerving the Nature of the* Accuſation, *and the* Arts, *uſed to inſinuate the Belief of it into the Minds of their* Governours, *judg'd it neceſſary to do their Part to clear themſelves from thoſe Imputations, which they did, in their* Proteſtations, Petitions, *and other* Writings, *by a Free, Open and Undiſguiſed Repreſentation of their* Principles *about the* Nature *and* Conſtitution, *and* Power *of Particular Churches ; and alſo about the King's* Supremacy, *making it Evident, that in all theſe Points, they agreed entirely with the* firſt Reformers, *even with them who ſate up a Church at* Franckfort, *in Queen* Mary's *days ; and had a Chief hand, in Reforming the Church of* England, *under Queen* Elizabeth, *who ſettled* Parochian Churches (*which for their Form, are the ſame with* Congregational) *as the only Churches of Divine Inſtitution, recognizing all the Superiorities*

and

and Preheminences which the Diocesan Bishop hath above the Presbyter to be only Jure Regio, *or* Parliamentario, *so that as the* Parochian Presbyters *are of God's Institution, the* Diocesan Bishop *is of the Prince's making; and accordingly, as every Creator takes care of his own Creature, as God has Provided a Maintainance for the* Presbyter, *the King hath also Endowed the Bishop, which is as I take it, the true reason why Sr.* Thomas Ridley, *a Person* Zealous *for the Church, in his* View of the Civil and Ecclesiastical *Laws, Par.* 3. *Cap.* 5. *Affirms,* That God hath *by his Word made Tythes due* to Parochian Churches, *but not to* Diocesan Bishops, whose Indowments stood *in* good Temporal, and Finable Lands, *which* Gratious *Princes,* and other good Benefactors of former Ages *bestowed upon them.*

The English Presbyterians *keeping tightly to those* Principles, *on which the Reformation began, were Esteemed by the* Nobility, *and* Gentry *to be Men of such* Peaceable Principles *as might be safely Indulg'd; who therefore oft in* Parliaments *made Application to the* Prince *on their behalf.*

On these Principles *the late* Union *between the Congregational and Presbyterian was entered into, giving so much* Security *to the Church of* England, *that no* Sincere Approver *of it, can have any hand in setting up that Government, which endangers it; Their being for any such* Model, *is a being for what destroys those Churches,*

which

which they themſelves Believe to be of God's Appointment. Nor Indeed can they be for the Divine Inſtitution of any other Particular Churches than what are Congregational, *unleſs upon this Principle,* [*That the Catholick-Church-Viſible is a* Govern'd Society, *that hath a Supreme Power under Chriſt,* Monarchical, Ariſtocratical, *or* Democratical, *Authorized to* Govern *the Whole by Legiſlation and Judgment*;] *Which is a Notion ſo contrary to what not only all true Proteſtants in general, but the* Engliſh Presbyterians, *as well as the* Congregationaliſts *in particular are for, that they deteſt, and abhor it.*

A Clear Conviction of theſe things, upon mature Deliberation, and a ſerious Obſervation of the Sentiments of our Wiſeſt and moſt kind Friends, with a ſincere Deſire, that my Brethren may be cleared from thoſe Aſperſions, (which either through the Inadvertency *of ſome of themſelves, or the Crafty Inſinuations of their Adverſaries) hath been caſt upon them, and that they may continue in the Peaceable Injoyment of that* Liberty, *which through the Auſpicious influence of the Government they are Poſſeſſed of, hath moved me to make this* Apologetical *Repreſentation of their Genuine Principles: Being ſtrongly Perſwaded, that as our* Governours *will conſider the Real difference there is between the Principles of the* Engliſh *and* Classical *Presbyterians, and notwithſtanding their Indignation againſt the* Latter, *will always extend their* Generous *and* Chriſtian Compaſſions *towards the* Former; *So my Brethren of the Preſbyterian*

lyterian Denomination, will give ſome Evident Demonſtrations of their ſincere and Conſtant adherence to thoſe Principles *of the* Engliſh Presbyterians, *as Delivered long ago in their* Proteſtations, &c. *and lately in the* Heads *of Agreement, and Particularly to thoſe* Articles of it, *by which they are ſet at the greateſt Diſtance from Intermedling with the* National Church Form.

Farewel.

A N

ERRATA.

PAge 49. line 20. for *Especially*, read *Specifically*. p. 61. l. 6. for *as*, read *and*; l. 16. for *Ecclesiastical*, read *Classical*.

AN APOLOGY FOR THE *English Presbyterians.*

THE Prejudices, which are, in the minds of many, against the *Presbyterians* in this Kingdom, arising from some mistaken Notions, entertain'd about the *Principles*, which Men of that Denomination are said to embrace, there can't be, I think, a more Effectual Apology made for them, than what is done by an Impartial Representation of those Principles they do really own; and what, tho' laid to their Charge, they do with the most Indignation and Abhorrence disavow. I will therefore faithfully propose *what* the *English Presbyterians*, for whom *alone* I make this Plea, *do*, and *do* not, *hold*; And for the greater satisfaction of my *Reader*, I

will ſet in the cleareſt Light I can, the Notions eſpouſed by the *Claſſical* or *Scotch Presbyterians*, with which the *Engliſh* could never comply; though upon the Suppoſal, that they are *zealous Defenders* of that *Claſſical* Government, they have fall'n under the Diſpleaſure and Contempt of our *Civil* and *Eccleſiaſtical* Gonours.

SECT. I.

What are the Principles *about* Church-Government, *held by the* Engliſh Preſbyterians, *wherein they do* differ *from the* Claſſical-Scotch-Presbyterians.

§. 1. THE *Principles* held by the *Engliſh Presbyterians* about the *Conſtitution*, and Power of Particular Churches, and their Subordination to the Civil Magiſtrate, are briefly theſe.

1. That a Governing Church is of no larger Extent than a Worſhipping Congregation.

2. That the Ruling Power of their Officers is not to be ſtretch'd beyond the Bounds and Limits of their Worſhipping Congregation.

3. That

3. That what Power beſides this is requiſite to reform the Diſorders in Particular Churches, ſuch as the Removing Scandalous and Heretical Teachers, *&c.* is veſted in the *Civil Magiſtrate.*

4. That it belongs alſo to the Civil Magiſtrate to convene Synods, or Aſſemblies of Miniſters, when there ſhall be an occaſion for them, whoſe Power, when convened, is only *Perſuaſive*, not *Coercive.*

§. 2. The Principles, which the *Claſſical* or *Scotch Presbyterians*, who aſſert the *Divine Right* of a *National Church-Government*, do advance, are,

1. That *One Governing* Church is made up of *many worſhipping* Congregations.

2. That the Ruling Power of their Officers is extended beyond the Bounds of a ſingle Congregation. For, by aſſerting the Catholick Church Viſible to be a *Govern'd Society*, or *Organnick Body*, they muſt neceſſarily, and do profeſſedly own, that the Miniſtry, Ordinances, and Cenſures are given firſtly to the Catholick Church Viſible, and ſecondarily to particular Churches, which, whether Congregational, Claſſical, Provincial. *&c.* are not *properly* Churches, but only *Parts* or *Members*

diverſly combin'd) of the *Catholick Church*, which is the only proper Viſible Church, whereupon all Church-Power is habitually ſeated in the Officers of the *Catholick Church Viſible*, as *ſuch*, and therefore extended beyond the Bounds of ſingle Congregations, even to the utmoſt Limits of the Catholick Church Viſible.

3. That the Ruling Officers in their larger Aſſemblies, *viz. Claſſical*, *Provincial*, *National*, *Patriarchal*, and *Oecumenical*, have a Power inherent in them to reform the Diſorders of particular Churches, and to remove ſcandalous or Heretical Teachers.

4. That it belongs to the Church and not to the *Civil Magiſtrate*, to convene Synods or Aſſemblies of Miniſters and other Ruling Officers.

§. 3. In theſe particular Inſtances, you have a full, though brief Account of what is embraced by the *Engliſh*, and by the *Claſſical Presbyterians*. And it's now my Part to *vindicate* the *former* from thoſe Reproaches unjuſtly caſt upon them, and ſhew that the Charge can not be fairly laid at the Door of any *Presbyterian*, but the *Claſſical*.

§. 4.

§. 4. That I may do the *English Presbyterians* Justice, in the representing their Principles I must consider what the miserable State of the Church was before *Luther*; upon what Principles the Protestants went in their Endeavours to reform the Church; and then evince, that the *English Presbyterians* stuck firmly to those Principles, upon which the Separation was made from the Church of *Rome*.

SECT. II.

The Miserable State of the Church before Luther, *the* Principles *on which the Reformation was begun and carryed on, with a state of the Controversie between* Papist, *and* Protestant. *The* English *Presbyterians constantly adhered to the* Reformed *about Church-Government, particularly* Cartwright *&c.*

§. 1. ABout the time that *Luther* with many others endeavour'd a Reformation of the Church, the Great Evil complained of was the Intolerable *Tyranny* of the Ecclesiasticks. The People were then so very much under the Power of the Clergy, that they were perfect

Strangers to the leaſt Part of Chriſtian Liberty, beſides, the Inferiour Clergy ſo grievouſly Oppreſſed by their Superiours, and all ſo much Slaves to the Pleaſure of the greateſt, that throughout all *Europe*, the Miſeries of the People were ſo great and preſſing, that none durſt open their Mouths in favour of their Ancient Rights, and Privileges. Yea,

§. 2. The *Domination*, and *Tyranny* of Popiſh Prelates, who aimed more at Worldly Grandeur, than at the advancing Chriſt's Glory, was grown to ſuch a Height, that they did what-ever was good in their own Eyes, and that they might do it with the greater Countenance, they aſſerted, that there was a Catholick Church Viſible; that this Catholick Viſible Church was One Governed Corporation, or Society, under one ſupreme Governing Power, to which they aſcended by ſundry ſteps, from the Dioceſane to the Provincial, from thence to the Patriarchal.

§. 3. The firſt Reformers, as many of their Fore-Fathers, ſuch as the *Wickliffiſts*, *Huſſiſts*, &c. groaning under theſe Inſupportable Burdens, and throughly under-

underſtanding from whence they had their Riſe, laid the Ax to the Root of the *Antichriſtian* Tyranny, denying that there was a *Catholick Church Viſible.*

§. 4. Here the Reformed fix'd their Foot, affirming, that the Univerſal Church was made up only of *Elect Believers*, and was *Inviſible:* that thoſe ſpecial Privileges, which the *Papiſts* appropriated to their Catholick Church Viſible, belonged only to the *Inviſible* Church, and hereby left no foundation for the raiſing a Catholick Church Government upon, for *Sublato Fundamento tollitur Opus*, and thus their Catholick Government fell to the Ground. The Government, in Controverſie, being *External*, as well as Catholick, muſt have a Viſible as well as a Catholick Church for its *State*; ſo that where no ſuch *Catholick Church*, there can be no ſuch *Catholick Government.* On the other hand,

§. 5. The *Papiſts* being fully convinced that the *Reformers* had taken the moſt effectual way to ſubvert their Church Government, and diveſt them of that Authority they aſſumed to themſelves over the Conſciences of the People, owned it,

and in Oppoſition unto them, held that there was a *Catholick Church Viſible*, under an External Polity, or Government. So *Alphonſus a Caſtro adverſ. Hæreſ.* Lib. 1. "The *Wickliffiſts*, *Huſſiſts*, and *Lutheranes* "do ſtifly inſiſt on the Inviſibility of the "*Catholick Church*, and is the ſtrongeſt "Shield they have to defend themſelves "againſt whatever is urged from the "*Church's Authority*, which is the ſharpeſt "Weapon we can uſe againſt them. *Gregory de Valentina Anal. Fid. Cathol. lib.* 6. *Chap.* 3. "If the *Univerſal Church* "be Compoſed only of thoſe who are "*Predeſtinated*, and *truly Righteous*, the "*Government* of the Church of *Rome* "can never be defended. And *Rodericus de Arriago* confeſſeth, (*de Divin. fid. Diſp.* 7. §. 1. *Num.* 3.) *That the true Reaſon, why they lay ſo much ſtreſs upon this* Part *of the* Controverſie, *is becauſe the* Support *of the* Papall Power *Depends upon it.* Many other Authorities may be at any time produced for the Confirmation of this Point, but the thing it ſelf is ſo clear that it's not needful.

§. 6. The Reformed in this Kingdom agree'd with the *Wickliffiſts*, *Huſſiſts*, and *Lutheranes*, owning that the Catholick Church

Church was no otherwiſe *viſible*, than as it might be ſeen in Particular Church-Aſſemblies, which cloſely examined amounts to more, than that there is no Church, *properly* ſpeaking, *Viſible*, but what is Particular, and no *External* Church-Government but what is *ſeated* in Particular Churches; that the Reforming ſuch *Diſorders*, as cannot be done by that Power which is Peculiar to *Parochiall*, or *Congregational* Churches, belongs to the *Civil Magiſtrate*, *viz.* ſuch as the convening the Aſſemblies of Miniſters, and the removing Scandalous, Turbulent, and Heretical Teachers. But

§. 7. If all that Power, which is *meerly Spiritual* and *Eccleſiaſtical*, be appropriated to *particular* Congregations, then all that Power exerciſed in *Claſſical*, *Dioceſane*, *Provincial*, *National*, *Patriarchal*, and *Oecumenical* Synods or Aſſemblies, falls to the ground, together with their having *Authority* to determine Controverſies of Faith; for *ſublato fundamento tollitur opus*, as has been already obſerved.

§. 8. This being for many Years after the Reformation began in this Land, generally received, the *Engliſh Presbyterians* took

took Advantage againſt that Part of the Church of *England*, which retaining too much of the Catholick Church Leven, would fain have preſerved ſomewhat of the old Papal Power. Some feeble Efforts were put forth in the Reign of Queen *Elizabeth* and *James* the Firſt, but *re infecta*; and in the Reign of *Charles* the Firſt, by the help of Archbiſhop *Laud* and his Followers, great Advancements were made towards the Reſtoring this Power; But

§. 9. The general Vogue of the *Epiſcopal*, as well as the Cry of the *Nonconformiſts*, being againſt the Exerciſe of any ſuch Power, the Difficulties the Archbiſhop met with were next to inſuperable; eſpecially upon the account of the Different Copies, about the Twentieth *Article* of the Church of *England*, for as ſome Copies begin *thus*, [" The Church " hath Power to decree Rites and Cere- " monies and *Authority* in *Controverſies of* " *Faith*, it is not Lawfull *&c.*] So others begin at, [*It is not Lawfull*, &c.] Whereupon *Laud*'s Party found it neceſſary to oppugn the old Doctrine about the Authority and Government of the Church, and whereas the 20th Article in ſome Ancient

Ancient Copies of the Queen's Reign began at, [*It is not Lawfull for the Church to Ordain any thing that is contrary to God's Word*, &c.] 'twas such an Obstacle in the way of their Designs, that they were hard put to it, and found it necessary, if possible, to remove it. And accordingly

§. 10. Dr. *Heylin*, a chief Instrument in this Design, did on the 24th day of *April*, *Ann.* 1627. answer in the Divinity-Schools at *Oxon*, upon these two Questions, *viz.* (1.) *An Ecclesia unquam fuit invisibilis?* And (2.) *An Ecclesia possit errare?* Both which he determined in the *Negative*. And in stating of the first, he fell upon a different way from that of Dr. *Prideaux*, in his Lecture, *De Visibilitate Ecclesiæ*, and other *Tractates* of and about that time, in which the *Visibility* of the Church, was no otherwise proved, than as scattered amongst the *Waldenses*, *Wickliffists*, *Hussists*, &c. For *Heylin*, not liking this manner of Proceeding, because it utterly discontinued the Succession in the Ecclesiastical Hierarchy chose rather to look for a *Continual Visible Church*, in *Asia*, *Ethiopia*, *Greece*, *Italy*, and *Rome* it self.

§. 11. In

§. 11. In the Year 1633. *Heylin* was at *Oxon* to Anſwer for his *Degree* of *Doctor*, and inſiſted on the *Authority* of the Church, as formerly he did on the *Infallibility*, and *Viſibility* of it. His Queſtions were (1.) *An Eccleſia habeat Authoritatem in Decernendis fidei Controverſiis?* (2.) *Interpretandi Scripturas?* (3.) *Decernendi Ritus & Ceremonias?* all which he held in the *Affirmative*; declaring it to be the *Plain* and *Poſitive* Doctrine of the Church of *England* in the 20th Article, which runs thus, *in terminis* viz. *Habet Eccleſia Ritus* ſive *Ceremonias ſtatuendi Jus, & in fidei Controverſiis Authoritatem:* But,

§. 12. Dr. *Prideaux*, then in the Chair, expreſſed great Diſſatisfaction with *Heylin*, charging him with falſifying the Publick Doctrine of the Church, as others accuſed *Laud* and other Biſhops, for making this Addition, the better to ſupport their *Power* and *Tyranny*. But, ſaith *Heylin*, in his *Examen Hiſtoricum*, "Archbi-"ſhop *Laud* in his *Speech* in the *Star-*"*Chamber*, *June* 15. 1637. made it ap-"pear, that the ſaid Clauſe was in a "Printed Book of Articles, publiſhed in "the Year 1563. being but very few "Months

" Months after they had paſſed in the " Convocation, which was on the 29th " of *January*, 1562. in the *Engliſh* Ac- " count; and more than ſo, he ſhewed " unto the Lords a Copy of the 20th " Article, exemplified out of the *Records*, " and atteſted by the hands of a Pub- " lick Notary, in which that very Clauſe " was found, which had been charged " upon the Biſhops for an Innovation. " And thus much I can ſay of my own " Knowledge, that having occaſion to " conſult the Records of Convocation, I " found this controverted Clauſe *verba-* " *tim*, in theſe following words; *Habet Ec-* " *cleſia Ritus ſtatuendi Jus, & in fidei Contro-* " *verſiis Authoritatem*, ſo far Dr. *Heylin*, p. 144. who further adds, " That in the " Year 1571. (the *Puritan* Faction begin- " ning to grow very ſtrong) the Articles " were again Printed in *Latin* and *En-* " *gliſh*, and this Clauſe left out, Publiſh- " ed according to thoſe Copies in the " *Harmony of Confeſſions*, Printed at *Ge-* " *neva*, *Ann.* 1612. That the Archbiſhop " in his Speech, *p.* 71. was of this Opi- " nion too.

§. 13.

§. 13. There was, we see, a great deal of stress laid on this Clause of the 20th Article, because the Assertion, that *the Church hath Authority in Controversies of Faith*, is so necessary to *National* and larger Synods and Assemblies, and the laying aside this Clause so accommodated to the Principles on which the Reformation was begun and carried on. For which reason I will offer what I know of this matter, and therein be very impartial.

§. 14. (1.) That this Clause is not either in the *Latin* or *English* Copies, Printed *Ann.* 1571. is granted by Dr. *Heylin*, and I have by me a Copy in *Latin*, published by *John Day*, *Ann.* 1575. in which 'tis not. (2.) I have seen a Copy, *Ann.* 1563. in which it is, and so it may be in the *Records* of the Convocations, as has been suggested, for ought that I do know to the contrary. However (3.) I do affirm upon my own Knowledge, and in most humble manner address my self to the present Archbishop of *Canterbury*, who was of *C. C. C. C.* to Dr. *Green*, *Master*, and to the worthy *Fellows* of that College, for their concurrent Testimony, that in the *Manuscript* Library, given to that House

Houſe by Archbiſhop *Matthew Parker*, there are the *Articles* of the Church of *England*, (which I can't call *thirty nine* becauſe they are more) ſubſcribed by the Biſhops, in the Year 1562. with the number of Pages, and of every Line in each Page in which the Articles are; and that the *twentieth* Article is exactly the ſame with the *twenty firſt* of *Edward* VI. without this Clauſe; whence I conclude, *firſt*, That the leaving of it out being, as is acknowledged by Archbiſhop *Laud* and Dr. *Heylin*, moſt adjuſted to the Principles of the *Nonconformiſts*, the true and genuine Reaſon is, becauſe the firſt Reformers of the Church of *England*, and the *Nonconformiſts* were of a mind in this Particular, and oppoſed the Papal Tyranny upon the ſame Foundation. *Secondly*, That although in the beginning of the Queen there were ſome otherwiſe minded, who added this Clauſe to the Copy of 1563. yet the Biſhops unanimouſly adhered to the Copy which laid this Clauſe aſide. But to return; It is manifeſt,

§. 15. That the Old *Nonconformiſts*, whom I call *Engliſh Presbyterians*, being firm Adherers unto the firſt Reformers, did in their Oppoſition to the *Papal Tyranny*,

ranny, hold, *first*, That there was no proper Visible Church, but what was Particular; *secondly*, That Particular Churches were of the same Extent with Single Congregations; and the Power of those in Office was confined to the Limits of a single Congregation.

§. 16. The Learned Mr. *Cartwright*, a Person of that esteem amongst the *Nonconformists* in the Reign of the Queen, as to be chosen by them to defend their Principles against Dr. *Whitgift*, expressing their sense with much Freedom and Clearness, I need insist on no other to prove what I affirm of them; and who-ever is conversant with the Books then written, will see, that their Authors so generally and frequently refer'd themselves to his Writings; and so constantly undertook his *Defence* as to be satisfied, that the mentioning what was pressed by others is altogether unnecessary.

§. 17. This Learned *Cartwright*, writing in *Defence* of the *Admonition* to the *Parliament*, (Published in the Year 1572. Answered by Dr. *Whitgift*,) doth not only make a *Reply* to that *Answer*, which was in the Year 1574. defended by *Whitgift*;

gift; But in his *Reply* to this *Defence* of the *Answer*, *Anno* 1575. expresseth himself fully to this effect, I both mention *Cartwright*'s *Reply* to *Whitgift*'s *Defence* of the *Answer*, and do inculcate it, because *Fuller*, *Heylin*, and *Walton*, have told the World, that the *Defence* of the *Answer* kept the Field with all the Marks of an absolute Victory; whereas it's most manifest, that *Cartwright* made a *Reply* thereunto in *two Parts*, the *First*, *Anno* 1575. and *Anno* 1577. he Published the rest. And what is Remarkable, *Fuller*, in the same or very next Page, where he so confidently avers, that *Cartwright* never Replyed to the *Second Answer*, doth himself refer to the first part of the *Reply*, that was made unto it. See his *Church Hist. Cent.* 16. *l.* 9. *p.* 102. Now in the first Part of this *second Reply*, *Cartwright* fully Confirms the Truth of my Assertion, "That *every Particular Church* should "have her *Bishop*, is manifest by *Paul* to "*Timothy*. For seeing the Discription of a "Bishop which he gives doth *Agree* unto "the Minister of every *Congregation*, and "nothing there requir'd in *the* one, which "is not in the *other*, it follows, that the "*Minister of every Congregation* is the "*Bishop* thereof. For the Description

" agreeing with every of them, the things
" described must likewise. Secondly, un-
" less he do by this description of the Bi-
" shop set forth the nature of every Mi-
" nister of the Word in his Congregation,
" in describing the Offices of the Church
" he has left out the *Principalest* Mem-
" bers, and was more careful in describing
" the *Deacons* Ministry, not occupied in
" the Word, than the teaching Ministries,
" But that is absurd; it must follow that
" he understood them by the name of
" *Bishop*: Furthermore St. *Paul*'s *Bishop*
" was appointed to the same *Place*, where-
" unto his *Deacons*: But his *Deacons* were
" assigned to a *Particular Congregation*——
" St. *Paul* also there assigning the Charge
" and Care of the *Bishop* over the *Church* of
" God, must either give him Charge over
" the *Whole Body* of the *Catholick Church*,
" or over *One Particular Congregation*; or
" of the *Faithfull Company* of *one House*:
" But he extendeth not the Charge over
" *all the Catholick Church*, for that were to
" make a *Pope* not a *Bishop*; nor restrain-
" eth him to the Faithful of one House-
" hold, considering that he opposeth the
" Government of his *House* to the *Govern-
" ment* of the Church: It followeth there-
" fore that he appointeth him to one *Par-*

ticular

" *ticular Church.* That by this *Word* " [*Church*] muſt be underſtood *one* of *theſe* " three Significations, it ſtandeth upon " this Ground; that in none of St. *Paul*'s " other Epiſtles, or St. *Luke*'s Writings, " that word [*Church*] is ever uſed other- " wiſe; and never ſignifieth the *Church*, " either of a *Province* or *Dioceſe*, *Rep.* 2. " *Part.* 1. *p.* 360. and in *page* 687. ſaith he, " I have ſhewed that Scripture uſeth not " to call a *Province* or *Dioceſe*, a *Church*, " but either the whole *Univerſal*, or elſe " a *Particular Congregation.* Thus you ſee " how Mr. *Cartwright* doth, not only hold " a *Presbyter* and a *Biſhop* to be the " ſame office, but that the office of a " Presbyter is *Appropriated* to a *ſingle Con-* " *gregation*, and that the Holy Scripture " never ſpeakes of a *Dioceſane* or *Provincial* " Church, but only of the *Univerſal* (which " is Inviſible) and a *Particular Church*, and " therefore not of a *Claſſical Church.* But

§. 18. What I ſhall offer from the multitude of *Nonconformiſts*, whoſe Sorrows encreaſed on *James* the Firſt's coming to the *Engliſh* Throne, will evidence what I affirm to Perſons of the meaneſt Capacities. For Dr. *Ames*, who gathered up the ſence of theſe Old *Nonconformiſts*,

whom he ſtyles, in his Preface to his *Engliſh Puritaniſm*, [*Rigid Presbyterians*,] declared poſitively, that they Hold and Maintain, "That every *Company*, *Congre-*
"*gation*, and Aſſembly of true Believers,
"joining together according to the Or-
"der of the Goſpel, in the *true Worſhip*
"*of God*, is a *true Viſible* Church of
"Chriſt; and that the ſame Title [*viz.*
"of *True Viſible Church*] is *Improperly*
"given to other Societies, Combinations,
"or Aſſemblies whatſoever——That
"Chriſt Jeſus hath not *Subjected* any
"Church, or Congregation of his to
"any other Superiour Eccleſiaſtical Juriſ-
"diction than unto *that* which is *within*
"*it ſelf*. So that if a whole Church, or
"Congregation, ſhall err in any Matter
"of Faith, and Religion, no other *Churches*,
"or *Spiritual Church-Officers*, have (by any
"Warrant from the Word of God,)
"Power to *Cenſure*, Puniſh or *Controul*
"the ſame: But are only to *Counſel*, or
"*Adviſe* the ſame, and leave their *Souls*
"to the immediate Judgment of Chriſt,
"and their Bodies to the Sword and
"Power of the CIVIL MAGISTRATE,
"who alone upon Earth hath Power to
"Puniſh a whole Church or Congrega-
"tion——They hold, that every Eſtab-
liſhed

" liſhed Church ought (as a ſpecial Pre-
" rogative, wherewith ſhe is endowed
" by Jeſus Chriſt) to have Power and
" Liberty to chooſe their own Spiritual
" and Eccleſiaſtical Officers---They hold
" and believe the *Equality* in Eccleſiaſtical
" Juriſdiction, and Authority of Church-
" es and Church-Miniſters, is no more *De-*
" *rogatory* and Repugnant to the *State*
" and Glory of a Monarch, than the Parity
" and Equality of School-Maſters or Ma-
ſters of Families. *Chap.* 2. §. 1. 5. 11.
There was alſo about this time a Proteſta-
tion of the Kings Supremacy made in the
Name of the Afflicted Miniſters, in
which they declare. " That they confine,
" and bound all Eccleſiaſtical Power
" within the Limits only of one Par-
" ticular Congregation; holding, that the
" greateſt Eccleſiaſtical Power ought not
" to ſtretch beyond the ſame: And that
" it is an ARROGATING PRINCELY *Supre-*
" *macy*, for any Eccleſiaſtical Perſon or Per-
" ſons whoſoever, to take upon themſelves
" Eccleſiaſtical Juriſdiction over many
" Churches---That it is utterly unlaw-
" ful for any one Miniſter to take upon
" himſelf, or accept of a ſole Eccleſiaſti-
" cal Juriſdiction over ſo much as one
" Congregation. And therefore ſome of

" the moſt Honeſt and Godly in the Con-
" gregation, ought to be adjoined to the
" Miniſter, in the Spiritual Regiment of
" the Souls of the Congregation, of which
" he is a Paſtor----That thoſe Eccleſiaſti-
" cal Perſons, that make claim to greater
" Power and Authority than this, eſpeci-
" ally they that make claim *Jure Divino*,
" of Power, or Juriſdiction to meddle
" with other Churches than that one
" Congregation, of which they are or
" ought to be *Members*, do USURP UPON
THE SUPREMACY OF THE CIVIL MA-
GISTRATE. §. 24, 25, 27. And a little
before, §. 12. "We hold that the King has
" Power to *Remove* out of the Churches,
" all *Scandalous; Schiſmatical*, and *Hereti-*
" *cal Teachers*. And, §. 14. That the King
" only hath Power within his Dominions
" to Convene Synods, or *General Aſſem-*
" *blies* of *Miniſters*.

§. 9. Soon after this Proteſtation, a *Chriſtian*, and *Modeſt Offer* of a *moſt In-differ ent Conference*, or Diſputation about the Main and Principal Controverſies betwixt the Prelates, and the late Silenced Miniſters in *England*, was made; in which, *viz. P.* 2, 3. the *Nonconforming* Miniſters undertook to prove, " That
" there

" there is no *true Visible* Church of Christ,
" but *a Particular* Ordinary *Congregation*
" *only*; that every true *Visible* Church of
" Christ, or Ordinary Assembly of the
" Faithful, hath by Christ's Ordinance,
" Power in it self, immediately under
" Christ, to *Elect* and *Ordain*, *Deprive* and
" *Depose* their Ministers; and to Execute
" all other *Ecclesiastical Censures*: That
" the Pastor of a Particular Congregati-
" on is the Highest Ordinary Ecclesiasti-
" cal Officer in any true Constituted Vi-
" sible Church of Christ: That the *Civil*
" *Magistrates* ought to be the *Overseers*
" of Provinces, and Dioceses, and of
" THE SEVERAL CHURCHES THEREIN:
" And it is their Office and Duty injoyned
" them by God, to *take Knowledge*, to *Pu-*
" *nish* and Redress all Misgoverning, or
" ill Treating of any Church, or Church-
" Officer.

§. 10. What is here affirm'd by these Deprived Ministers is so full, not only against the *Diocesan*, but *Classical* way, that it may tempt some to take it for Granted, That whilst I profess to set down the Principles of the *English Presbyterians*, I am only describing the *Brownists*, in which they will, perhaps, be confirm'd, when

they consider, that in this same Offer it's asserted, "That the *Pastor* alone ought "not to exercise Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction "over his Church, but others ought to be "joyned to him by the Assignment of the "same Church, NEITHER OUGHT HE, "AND THEY TO PERFORM ANY *Main*, "and *Material Ecclesiastical Act*, WITH-"OUT THE FREE CONSENT OF THE "CONGREGATION: However it's very manifest, that these *Nonconformists* were far from closing with *Brownism*, as appears from what they *Answer* to the 11th *Opposition*, in which 'tis demanded, ["Why "do they not wholly with the *Brownists* "separate, and get them to *Amsterdam*, to "their Holy Brethren there?] Where "they Protest, that they are Persuaded, "that many of the Conforming Ministers "are true Ministers of Jesus Christ, in-"dowed with Gifts from Heaven for that "Holy Function: And that the *Holy* "*Churches*, which they teach are true Churches; which was sufficient to clear them from the Reproaches of being *Brownists*.

§. 11. And as they so freely express their own true Sense in these Matters, so it is with an Assurance, that none of the Con-

Conformable Clergy were ſo much againſt the above-mentioned Aſſertions, which they undertook to maintain, but would rather Cloſe with them, than Expoſe themſelves to the Laſh of ſuch Penalties as the Deprived Miniſters lay under: Their Words are *Pag.* 16, 17. "The "former Propoſitions are ſuch, that there "will not be found, (as we are *verily* "*perſwaded* in our Conſciences) *any one* "*Conformable* Miniſter, except he be a "*Masked Papiſt*, that will *Refuſe to ſub-* "*ſcribe* to ANY ONE OF THEM, if ſo be it "would pleaſe the King and State by "Law to Urge them thereunto, under "ſuch Penalties as the Miniſters are urged "to ſubſcribe unto the Articles, deviſed "by the Prelates------ Yea, we are out "of all doubt, that the Prelates themſelves, if the caſe ſtood but upon the ſaving of their *Temporalities*, (which elſe "they ſhould loſe) would *with* HEART, "and HAND ſubſcribe to ANY ONE of "the aforeſaid Propoſitions. Beſides,

§. 12. Theſe *Engliſh Presbyterians* were ſo fully convinced of the Truth of the aforeſaid Propoſitions, which they offered to defend, that they were perſwaded they were ſuch, that if the Miniſters ſhould not

not constantly hold, and maintain the same against all Men, they cannot see how possibly (by the Rules of Divinity) the SEPARATION of *our Churches* from the Church of *Rome*, and from the *Pope*, the *Supream Head* thereof, can be Justified, *p.* 11. But,

§. 13. As this offer for a *Conference* was made in the Year 1606, so 'twas followed *Anno* 1609, with a Petition of the Deprived Ministers, in which they declare themselves thus, "As we hold, That your "Majesty within your *Dominions*, have "Power to call *Synods*, and to Dissolve "them, so we hold likewise, that RULING "*Synods*, and UNITED *Presbyteries*, ex- "ercising Government and Imposing "Laws and Decrees upon *several Churches*, and the *Pastors* of them, are not "only *Humane Institutions*, but in regard "of the said Government and Authority "of *Imposing Laws altogether* UNLAWFUL, "and USURPING *upon* the SUPREMACY *of* "*the Civil* MAGISTRATE---- We acknow- "ledge (as hath been above remembred) "no other Power, and Authority for the "OVERSEEING, RULING, and Censuring "of Particular Churches (how many "soever in number) in the Case of their "*Misgovernment*, than that which is *Ori-*

"*ginally*

" *ginally* Inveſted in *your Royal Perſon*, and " from it derived to ſuch of your Laity, " as you ſhall Judge Worthy to be De- " puted to the Execution of the ſame un- " der you; ſo as the Favour humbly ſollici- " ted by us is, *That whereas our Lord Je-* " *ſus* hath given to each PARTICULAR " CHURCH, or ORDINARY CONGREGA- " TION this Right, and Priviledge, *viz.* " *To Elect, Ordain*, and Deprive her own " Miniſters; and to Exerciſe all other " Parts of *Lawful Eccleſiaſtical Juriſdiction* " under him. So far the *Petitioning Mi-* *niſters* (*P.* 13, 14.) who (in *P.* 18.) ſay, " That in this Church (ſpeaking of a Par- " ticular Church, and the Officers there- " of) which is *confined within the Bounds* " *of a Pariſh*; one is a *Paſtor*, another a *Teacher*, others *Elders*, and others *Deacons*.

§. 14. Theſe Quotations out of the old *Engliſh Presbyterians*, do ſufficiently evince, that they held, that *properly* ſpeaking, there was no other Viſible Church, but what was Congregational, that the Power of their Officers is not to be ſtretched beyond the Bounds of a ſingle Congregation; that what Power is needful beſides this, for Reforming Particular Churches, is Inveſted in the Civil Magiſtrate, to whom it doth alſo belong to Convene Synods, *&c.* And it muſt be alſo Remark'd, §. 15.

§. 15. That in these Instances the *English Presbyterian*, and the *Congregationalist* are most entirely Agreed, as appears, not only from what is in the *Preface* to the *Savoy* Confession, where it's Declared by them in these Words: "As for our "selves we are able to trace the Footsteps "of an *Independent Congregational* way, in "the Antientest Customs of the Churches, "as also in the WRITINGS of our soundest "*Protestant Divines*, and (that which we "are much satisfied in) a full Concurrence "throughout, in all the Substantial Parts "of Church-Government with our Reve-"rend Brethren, the *Old Puritan Noncon-"formists*------See *Puritanis. Angl.* by Dr. "*Ames*, as the Opinions of *Whitehead*, "*Gilbe*, *Fox*, *Dearing*, *Greenham*, *Cart-"wright*, *Venner*, *Fulk*, *Whitaker*, *Rai-"nolds*, *Perkins*, &c. But also from what is in the *Preface* to the *English Presbytery*, (of which more in due place) where the Author, mentioning Dr. *Ames* his *Puritanism*, adds, *To which* Presbytery *is, at least, a Piece of a Successor.* And thus it continued till the Meeting of the *Assembly* of *Divines* at *Westminster* in the Year 1641, without the putting forth of any Efforts for the Classical by *Nonconformists*.

SECT.

SECT. III.

The Setting up of the Classical Presbytery *in this Land Attempted by the* Scots, *and by their Interests in the* Assembly *at* Westminster; *but met with so much Opposition, not only from the* INDEPENDENTS, *but from sundry others, that it could never take amongst us.*

§. 1. THE *English Presbyterians*, considered in Contradistinction unto the *Brownists*, and other Dissenters from the Church of *England*, prevailing from the beginning of the Reformation, till the *Assembly* at *Westminster*, met with some Check from the Attempts made upon them, as well as upon the Church of *England* by the *Scots*, and their Influence on the *Assembly*; but the *English Presbyterians* were so powerful in this Nation at that time, and the *Independents*, who, in the above-mention'd particulars, Agreed with the *English Presbyterians*, had obtain'd so great an Interest in the *Parliament*, and *Army*, and the Multitude of them, who Dissented from the Church of *England*, DOING so, upon a Principle that did set 'em as much against the *Classical* Church Go-

Government, the Obſtacles which lay in the way of the Aſſemblies ſetting up the *Claſſical Presbytery*, were ſo many, that they never adventured to Aſſert the Divine Right of that *Form*; and the *Parliament* would never allow of *all* the Aſſembly preſented to 'em. And what was by an *Ordinance* of both Houſes Eſtabliſhed, could never get Reputation enough amongſt the People to be generally Received.

§. 2. This being a Point of extraordinary Importance, in the preſent Caſe, I will be the more Diſtinct in my Attempt to clear it. And ſeeing 'tis Granted on all hands, that notwithſtanding the moſt the *Scots* and their Friends either in the *Parliament* or *Aſſembly* could do, the People of this Nation could never be Prevailed with to Submit to the *Claſſical* Church-Government, I will only ſhew what were the *True* Reaſons, why it could gain no more amongſts us, and the rather, becauſe not only Mr. *Robert Bayly*, in his *Diſſwaſive* from *Errour*, but alſo the Learned Mr. *Baxter*, in the *Narrative* he *gives of his own Life*, *p.* 73. do charge the *Independents* for being the only hinderers. Mr. *Bayly* with Unchriſtian bitterneſs,

and

and ſundry falſe and Rayling Accuſations, ſaith, " that all the *Prelates* and the *Papiſts* " cannot, nor do hinder ſo much the " work of *Reformation*, as the five *Diſ-* " *ſenting* Members, *viz.* the *Independents*; But Mr. *Baxter* with more temper, ſaith, " that the *five Diſſenting* Bretheren, " *Joyned with the Reſt till they had Drawn* " *up a* CONFESSION OF FAITH, a *Larger*, " and *Shorter Catechiſm*; but when they " came to *Church Government* they enga- " ged them in many long *Debates*, and " kept that Buſineſs as long as poſſibly " they could, Undetermined; and after " that, kept it ſo long *Unexecuted* in al- " moſt all Parts of the Land, ſaving *Lon-* " *don* and *Lancaſhire*, that their Party " had time to ſtrengthen themſelves in " the Army and the Parliament, and " hinder the *Execution* after all, and keep " the Government determined of, a ſtran- " ger to moſt of the People of this Land, " who know it but by *hearſay*, as it was " Repreſented by *Reporters*. So far Mr. *Baxter*, who to the ſhame of Mr. *Bayly* (whoſe *Claſſical Zeal* tranſported him him beyond all Bounds of Truth, when he Accuſed the *Independents*, for Patro- nizing all manner of Abominable Er- rours, and Hereſies,) hath confuted *him*, and

and done *them* the Juſtice of Leaving it on Record, that they Joyned with the *Aſſembly*, in the *Confeſſion of Faith*, *larger* and *ſhorter Catechiſm*. But

§. 3. My deſign is cheifly to clear the Truth and ſhow, that as the *Independents* did undoubtedly their Part to hinder the ſetting up of a National Church-Government, which would have Ruined thoſe Churches, which are of Chriſt's Inſtitution; ſo *there were others*, who attempted the ſame that the Independents did; for both the *Prelatiſts*, and the *Engliſh Presbyterians* had, upon different Reaſons, their hands in the Oppoſition, and alſo the Body of the People.

§. 4. 1. That the *Prelatiſts* had their ſhare in the hindring it, is Apparent from what is in the Letter ſent by the *Aſſembly* to the *Belgick*, and other *Reformed* Churches, *p.* 7. in which they declare, "That in thoſe Troubleſome times "the *Honourable Houſes of Parliament* cal- "led the Aſſembly to give them their beſt "Counſels for the Reformation of the "Church, *&c.*—And in this Work (ſay "they) we are now excerciſed, tho' the "*Enemy*

" *Enemy hath ſtirred up the Heart of our* " *Dear*, and *Dread Sovereign* AGAINST US. Now, it's well known that none ſo Powerful with the King, as the Church of *England*, who did, you ſee, their moſt to prevent the Aſſemblies erecting the Claſſical Government, by ſetting his Majeſty againſt them. But,

§. 5. 2. The great Impediment that lay in their way, was the Power of the *Engliſh Presbyterians*, who had Leaven'd the Gentry as well as the Common People, with Principles oppoſite unto the *Scotch* Church Government, and moſt conform to the Rule ſettled by the firſt Reformers, in *Defence* of their Separation from *Rome*. And whoever will conſider what the Parliament did in *Calling*, and *Directing* their *Synod*, and in *Approving* and *Rejecting* what was Preſented to them by the Aſſembly, will ſee reaſon enough to conclude I am in the Right. For,

§. 6. 1. This Synod was not called either in the *Dioceſan*, or *Claſſical* way, as Mr. *Baxter* obſerves, but the Parliament, as if Reſolv'd to take the *Engliſh Presbyterians* for their Conduct, choſe the Aſſembly themſelves. " The Parliament (ſaith

" Mr. *Baxter*, *ubi seq.*) not intending to " call an *Assembly*, which should pretend " a *Divine Right*, to make *Obliging Laws*, " or *Canons* to bind their Brethren, but an " *Ecclesiastical Council*, to be *Advisers* to " themselves, did think they best knew " who were the fittest to give them *Ad-* " *vice*, and therefore chose them all them- " selves. Thus touching their *Calling*, which was most Remote from the *Scotch-Classical* way, and conform to the *English-Presbyterian* Principles, who are only for *Perswasive Synods*.

§. 7. 2. This Assembly when thus called, could not proceed by virtue of any Inherent Power in themselves, but in all their Debates were confined by the Parliament; so Mr. *B.* " This Assembly was " confined by *Parliament*, to Debate *only* " such things as they *Proposed* to them. " And many *Lords* and *Commons* were " joyned in *Commission* with them, *to see*, " *that they did not go beyond their Commissi-* " *on*. So far was this Synod from being formed according to the *Classical Model*. Whence I infer,

§. 8. 3.

§. 8. 3. That one Reason, why the Assembly never adventur'd upon the settling the *Divine Right* of their Government, was because the Parliament would never endure it. I say, that this is one Reason; for they had another which moved them to wave the *Jus Divinum*, namely, their getting the greater Advantage against their Dissenting Brethren, by putting 'em on the Proof of divers other General Propositions, as necessary to evince, that the *Presbyterial* Government over many Congregations *might not be*; whereas, if the *Assembly* had Asserted the *Divine Right* of the Classical Government, or that it *rather should be*, the Debate might have much sooner come to an Issue; but their putting it only on a [*may be*,] left it in such Ambiguous and Incomprehensive Terms, as to necessitate their Opponents to those *Delays*, that were in this Debate.

But as this was one Reason, so the *Parliaments* being against the [*must be*,] had some Influence on the Assembly, and greatly Distressed them. And that the Parliament was against their *Divine Right*, is manifest from their Rejecting what did in the least look that way, as it's related in the *Preface* to the *Savoy-Confession*, where

'tis thus. "The Honourable Houſes of "Parliament thought it not convenient to "have Matters of *Diſcipline*, and *Church-Government* put into a *Confeſſion of Faith*, "eſpecially ſuch Particulars thereof as then "were, and ſtill are Controverted and "and under Diſpute by Men Orthodox "and ſound in Faith. The 30th Chapter therefore of that *Confeſſion*, as it was "preſented to them by the *Aſſembly*, which "is of *Church Cenſures*; as alſo *Cap.* 31. of "*Synods*, and *Councils*, by *whom* to be *called*, of what *Force* in their *Decrees* and "*Determinations*. ------Theſe were ſuch "*Doubtful* Aſſertions, and ſo Unſuitable "to a *Confeſſion* of *Faith*, as the Honourable Houſes in their Great Wiſdom "thought fit to lay them aſide. So manifeſt it is that the Parliament would never allow of the Church Government according to the *Scotch Modell*, nor ſuffer any thing to look like their Synods having an *Obliging* Power over their Brethren; and conſidering the State of Affairs in that juncture, nothing but a Conviction, that the *Engliſh Presbytery* was more agreeable to the Scripture Rule, than the *Claſſical*, could have hindered their Complyance with the *Scots* in this Matter. It is alſo further to be obſerved,

§. 9. 4.

§. 9. 4. That the Author of certain Conſiderations tending to Peace amongſt *Proteſtants*, Printed by *Parkhurſt*, *Anno* 1674, doth expreſs himſelf thus, *viz.* "The late *Presbyterian* Aſſembly, if you "will have it *called ſo*, DIFFERED MUCH "FROM THE ASSEMBLIES OF THE "CHURCH of *Scotland*. They at *Weſt-* "*minſter* (ſaith *Heylin*) Attribute *Power* "to the *Civil Magiſtrate*, not only of *cal-* "*ling Synods*, and *Church Aſſemblies*, but "alſo of being *Preſent* at *them*, and to "Provide, that whatever is therein con- "cluded, be done agreeably to the Mind "and Will of God. As to the *Matter* of "*Church-Government*, the *Divine Right* of "their *Presbyteries*------not a Word deli- "vered. Beſides, their *National-Aſſem-* "*blies* were to be *Subordinate* to the Power "of the *Parliament*, ----by the *Ordinance* "of the 14th of *March*, which makes it "*quite* ANOTHER THING *from the* SCOT- "TISH PRESBYTERIES, *and other Aſſem-* "*blies of the* KIRK, which hold themſelves "to be SUPREME, and UNACCOUNTABLE "in THEIR ACTINGS, *without* reſpect to "the KING, the PARLIAMENT, and the "*Courts* of *Juſtice*. So *Heylin*, in his *Hi-* "*ſtory of Presbyt.* p. 476. So that tho the

Scotch and *Classical-Presbyterians* laboured hard to set up their Government, yet could they not do it. Something of the *Shadow* of it they had, but not the Thing, and what they had, gave not satisfaction to the *London Presbyterians*. For,

§. 10. 5. The *Presbyterians* of the *Province* of *London*, considering the *Church-Government* Established by the *Ordinance* of *March* 14. 1645, did, in their *Considerations*, and *Cautions* from *Sion-Colledge*, *June* 19. 1646. declare, " That there is " not a *Compleat Rule* in *these* ORDINANCES: —That there are many *Necessary* " things, NOT YET ESTABLISHED; and " *some things* WHEREIN *their Consciences* " *are* NOT SO FULLY SATISFIED. And at this time they Published in the same Paper, " Their *Joynt Resolution* to Practise " in *all things* according to the *Rule of the* " *Word*, and according to these Ordinances, SO FAR AS THEY CONCEIVE THEM " CORRESPONDENT TO IT. Besides,

S. 11. 6. That Part of the Assemblies Confession, which gave most *Countenance* to the *Classical* way, as it was Rejected by the Parliament, so was it hastily Published from the *Scotch* Copy, where it had an Appro-

Approbation; and such is the Integrity of Zealots for the Classical Government, as to conceal the Approved Copy from the World, and Publish what never had an *Imprimatur* from that Government, which called the Assembly.

§. 12. These Considerations may convince the Impartial Reader, that how much soever the *English Presbytery* took in this Nation from the Beginning of the Reformation, yet the *Classical* way would not go down either with the Gentry or Common People; tho Episcopacy was laid aside, and *Scottish* Influences very powerful, yet could not the Parliament be prevailed with to Establish the *Classical* Government, and that their having somewhat like it, was enough to frighten the Sober People of *England* from a Closure with it. For,

§. 13. Tho in many Places the Ministers were for it, yet as Dr. *Du-Moulin*, "When "the *Presbyterian Government* came to the "*Execution* and *Practice*, there was not "*one* of ten Thousand of the People, that "would submit unto it.---And one of the "Ministers, who was the *most Eminent*, "confessed to me, that being Pastor of the

" Greateſt Pariſh, in *London*, he was ne-
" ver able to eſtabliſh in it a *Conſiſtory*, nor
" find any that would be of it, but a *Pitiful*
" *Scotch Taylor*. Vid. *Confor. of the Inde-
pendent Government, with that of the Primi-
tive*, p. 36.

§. 14. The *Cheſhire* Miniſters in their Atteſtation to the Teſtimony of the Reverend Brethren of the *Province* of *London*, expreſs their *Grief*, becauſe ſo much of the *Claſſical Presbytery* as was Eſtabliſhed, prevailed ſo little in moſt Places, and impute the true Reaſons of it, " Partly " to the Miſ-repreſentations of it to thoſe " that ſhould ſubmit unto it; For to ſome " it is (ſay they) rendered FORMIDABLE, " as if it were MORE OPPRESSIVE *than* " *ever the Prelacy was*; to others DESPI-" CABLE, for want of a *Competent Power* to " proceed to *Effectual* Reformation of Of-" fenders: That is, the Parliament annexed no Penalties to be Inflicted on them, who could not in Conſcience conform to this National-Church-Conſtitution. Moreover,

§. 15. There were amongſt the Miniſters a conſiderable Number, who entered into *Aſſociations*, and ſet up another ſort,

ſort of Government, comprehending the *Moderate Epiſcopal*, and the *Independents*, upon the Principles maintain'd by the *Engliſh Presbyterians*. For Mr. *Baxter*, who was an *Engliſh Presbyterian*, was the Great Promoter of it; who freely declared, he could not agree with the Aſſembly in every Point of Government (*ubi ſup. P.* 73.) and in *P.* 97. he mentions the Progreſs made of their Aſſociating Deſign.

§. 16. Thus great Endeavours were, during the time the Aſſembly ſate, for the bringing in the *Claſſical* Church Government, but 'twas ſo contrary to the *Genius* of the Nation, that no ſort, neither the Magiſtrate nor People, could be entirely for it, nor could the Shadow of it find acceptance amongſt us, the Sober Party, who Diſſented from the *Dioceſans*, being for the moſt part *Engliſh Presbyterians*, and *Congregationaliſts*.

SECT

SECT. IV.

The ENGLISH PRESBYTERY *after the Restauration of* Charles II. *prevail'd again, and so continued till the late Union commenced. These things shewn out of the Writings of Dr.* Collings, *and Mr.* Baxter.

§. 1. WHen *Charles* II. was Restored, soon after the *Presbyterians* were cast out, and the *Episcopal* put into their Places, whereupon the *Nonconformists*, who were not of the *Independent* way, did soon, by their Practice, and the several Books written in Defence of their *Nonconformity*, convince their closest Observers, that they were for those Principles, which the *English Presbyterians* had from time to time Asserted. And that thus much may with the greatest Clearness, and to the most satisfaction be evinced, I will refer to what Dr. *Collings*, and Mr. *Baxter* have offered on this Occasion.

§. 2. 1. Dr. *Collings*, who laboured much, and wrote well in the Controversie about Church-Government, gives an Account of

of the *main Opinions* of those Ministers, and People in *England*, who go under the Name of *Presbyterians*, and calls his Book ENGLISH PRESBYTERY.

§. 3. 2. In the Account he gives of their Opinions, he tells us, That they were for a *Catholick Church Visible*, which the Old *English Presbyterians* would never own; but then it must be observ'd, that he doth not represent them as Asserters of a Catholick Church Visible, form'd into *one Govern'd Society*, or *an Organick Body*. For he carefully appropriates the *Governing* Power to *fixed single Congregations*, in which the *Ruling Officers* may have the Knowledge of every Member under his Care ---- His Words are, "They Believe, "that Christ hath Appropriated *Ministers* "of the Gospel to this Visible Church, "who may Preach *the Gospel*, and *Baptize* "in any Parts of it, but CAN ONLY *Exercise* an *ordinary Jurisdiction*, in those "particular Parts of it, over which God "hath given them a particular *Oversight* as "*Pastors* and *Teachers*. *The Exercise of* "*Acts* of *Jurisdiction*, REQUIRING A PARTICULAR KNOWLEDGE of PERSONS OPINIONS, KNOWLEDGE, and CONVERSATION, which no single Person can "have

" have as to *all* the Members of the *Visi-*
" *ble Church*, *P.* 6. §. 4. and in the same
Page, §. 6. 'tis added, " They Believe
" Persons thus *set apart*, (as in a forego-
" going Paragraph) to the Ministry, are
" fully Authorized to Preach the Gospel,
" and to *Baptize* in any Place, where they
" are called to it, AND TO ADMINISTER
" THE LORD'S SUPPER, *when they shall be*
" FIXED IN ANY CONGREGATION, *that*
" *they may Administer it* knowingly to Per-
" sons, *that are able to discern the Lord's*
" *Body*-----and to EXERCISE ACTS OF JU-
" RISDICTION in THEIR FIXED CONGRE-
" GATION. And *P.* 10. §. 2. " An Ad-
" monition, which is a *Church Censure*, is
" the *Act* of the *whole Congregation*, or the
" Officers of it, as well in the *Name of*
" *Christ*, as IN THEIR NAMES, shewing
" a Person Offending his Errour from the
" Word of God, and Exhorting and
" Warning him to Reform. This they
" say, may be often Repeated.---4. *Excom-*
" *munication* being the Highest Censure,
" they Believe, ought not to be Denoun-
" ced by *any Persons*, but those whom
" God's Word hath appointed thereunto.
" ---The Persons Decreeing it, must be
" the *Church*, by its *Officer*, or *Officers*, (they
" agreeing thereunto—)

§. 4. 3.

§. 4. 3. The *Doctor*, in these *Paragraphs*, as he truly Represents the *English Presbyterians* to be of Opinion, that Christ's Ministers may *Preach* and *Baptize*, whenever in the Visible Church they are called so: He adds, That they say, the *Exercise* of *Jurisdiction* belongs to the *Minister*, as *he is fixed to a Congregation*; that he is to *Admonish* Ecclesiastically in *Christ's* and the *Churches Names*; that the Persons decreeing to Excommunicate, must be the *Church*, by the Officer, or Officers; allowing unto the *Christian Magistrate* more Power in these Matters than *Classical Presbyterians*, as in *P.* 8, 9, and so far from making the Catholick Church Visible, a *Governed Society*, or *Organnick Body*, that you see they Appropriate the Power of Jurisdiction unto a fixed a Congregation, without mentioning a Subordination of *Classical*, or *Provincial Assemblies* of the Ruling Officers, unto a National, or other Greater Synods. But,

§. 5. 1. The Learned Mr. *Baxter*, who about the Nature and Constitution of Particular Churches, hath been more Elaborate, and Convincing than most, in Defending their *Non-conformity* unto the Church

Church of *England*, doth most exactly describe the *English Presbyterians*, fetching his Arguments from the Inconsistency there is between the *Diocesan Government*, and the *Specific* Nature of Christ's *Instituted Churches*, *Ministry*, and *Discipline*. And,

§. 6. 2. That he may the more clearly shew where the *Strength* of his Arguments doth lie, he distinguisheth between *particular* Instituted *Churches*, and the *Catholick Church Visible*; affirming, that they are *Specifically Distinct* from each other, upon the account of the *different sorts* of *Communion*, that are had in a *Particular*, and in the *Catholick* Church. For, saith he,

§. 7. 3. *Communion*, which is the Essentiating *End* of these Societies, is twofold. The *one* sort is in the same *Species*, or *kind* of *Worship* only; and the *other*, in the same *Individual Acts of* Worship: Adding, that the Communion, which is in the same *kind* of Worship only, may be between them, who are at the greatest distance from each other, and consequently with every Member of the Catholick Church Visible, which therefore he calleth

leth *Catholick Communion*, and ſeeing it can be only in *kind*, it cannot be more *viſible*, as *ſuch*, than the *Species* of *things are*. But *Communion*, in the *ſame Individual Acts* of Worſhip, is by joyning in the ſame Ordinances of the *Word*, *Prayer*, and *Lord's Supper*, and they, who have Communion with each other, in this way, muſt meet in the ſame *Place*, at one and *the ſame time*, and 'tis therefore called *Perſonal-Preſential*, or Local Communion, which is therefore *Proper*, and *Adæquate* to a particular Congregational-Church. This is a thing that muſt be Inculcated, *viz.* *Communion* in the ſame Individual Acts, can be had only in a ſingle Congregation, becauſe *there alone* they can actually joyn in the ſame Worſhip; whence it neceſſarily follows,

§. 8. 4. That that Communion which is ſtretched beyond the Bounds of one ſingle Congregation, being only in the *ſame kind* of Worſhip, is of the *ſame ſort* with *Catholick* Communion. And ſeeing the Members of a *Dioceſan*, or *Claſſical* Church can have no other Communion with each other than what is *Catholick*, they want that Communion, which is Eſſential unto thoſe particular Churches which

which are of *Divine Inſtitution*, and ſpecifically diſtinguiſhed from the *Catholick* Church. And on the other Hand, the Aſſerting *Dioceſan*, or *Claſſical* to be particular Churches of the *Loweſt Rank* and *Order*, is *quantum in ſe*, a deſtroying Pariſh, or *Congregational Churches*; and as ſtretching particular Churches to a larger *Extent*, is to make the *Ends* of their *Conſtitution impoſſible* to be attained: As Mr. *Alſop*, in his *Miſch. of Impoſ.* "It is "very *Lawful* to build a *Ship*, or a *Man of* "*War* as big as two or three *Tachts*, which "may do better Service; but it's *folly* to "make *one* that would reach from *Calais* "to *Dover*, which muſt lie like a *Log* un-"meet for Sailing, and the Ends for "which *all Ships are Built*. Which he mentions to ſhew, that the extending a particular Church beyond the Bounds of a ſingle Congregation, doth fruſtrate the *End* of its Inſtitution; or, as Mr. *Baxter* has it, *makes* the Impoſſibility *of Chriſt's Diſcipline in our Churches undeniable.*

§. 9. 5. This Point being with much earneſtneſs ſtated by this Learned Perſon, he declares in the *Narrative he wrote of his own Life*, P. 339. "That one Charge, which the *Nonconformiſts* brought againſt our

our Prelacy is, "That it destroyeth the "*Species*, or *Form* of *Particular Churches*, "Instituted by Christ. The Churches "Instituted by Christ, are [*Holy Societies, Associated for* PERSONAL *Communion* under *their Particular Pastors.*] But all such Societies are Destroyed by the *Diocesan* Frame.-----*Ergo*, "It is destructive "of the *Form* of Particular Churches Instituted by Christ. They [*viz.* the "*Nonconformists*,] distinguish between "[*Personal*, *Local* Communion of Saints "by Pastors, and their Flocks] and [*Communion of Heat only*---] we have Heart-"Communion with all the Catholick "Church throughout the World-----But "[a *Holy Communion of Souls*, or *Individual Persons*, as Members of the same "Particular Church, for Publick Worship, and a Holy Life] is ESPECIALLY "distinct from the former, as is apparent "by the *Distinct End*: 2. The Distinct "*Manner* of Communion; yea, and the "*Matter* of it. And, in his *Treatise of* "*Episcopacy*, more fully. "We cannot "Subscribe to that Form of Church Government as *Good*, or *Lawful*, which in "its Nature Excludeth or Destroyeth *the* "*very Specifical Nature of the Particular* "*Churches*, *which were Instituted by the Ho-*

" *ly Ghoſt, and ſettled in the Primitive*
" *Times*---

" *But ſuch we take the preſent Dioceſan*
" *Form to be.* Ergo,

" The *Major* will be denied by very
" few that we have to do with. ----The
" *Minor* I thus prove.

" *The* Species *of a Particular Church,*
" *which the Holy Ghoſt did Inſtitute,* was
" [One *Society of* Chriſtians *united under*
" *one or more Biſhops, for* PERSONAL
" COMMUNION *in Publick Worſhip, and*
" *Holy Living.*

" *The Dioceſan* Engliſh *Frame is* [*De-*
" *ſtructive of,* or] *Inconſiſtent with the Spe-*
" *cies of a Particular Church.*

" Ergo, *The Dioceſan* Engliſh *Frame is*
" *Inconſiſtent with (or Deſtructive of) the*
" *Species of the Holy Ghoſt's Inſtitution.*

" In the *Major*, 1. By [*Biſhops*] I mean
" Sacred Miniſters, Authorized by Di-
" vine Appointment, to be the STATED
" Guides of the Church, by Doctrine,
" Worſhip, and Diſcipline.

By [*Perſonal Communion*] I mean, " That
" the ſaid Churches were no more nume-
" rous than our *Engliſh* Pariſhes, nor had
" more Aſſemblies; or no more than could
" have the ſame *Perſonal Communion*; and
" that there were never any Churches,

" *Infimæ*

" *Infimæ vel primæ Speciei*, which consist-
" ed of many such Stated Assemblies. I
" shall therefore now Prove, That the
" Churches of the Holy Ghost's Instituti-
" on, were no more Numerous, or were
" such *Single Congregations*.

" 1. From the *Holy Scriptures*.

" 2. From the *Confession* of the *Dio-
" cesans*.

" 3. From the *Testimony* of *Antiquity*.

" All proving fully, That the Ancient
" Episcopal Churches, were but *such sin-
" gle Societies*, or *Congregations*, as I have
" described.

§. 10. 6. What Mr. *B.* here affirms, respects chiefly the *Communion* of the *Church*, and upon this account he doth from the *Specifical* Difference there is between *Catholick*, and *Particular Church Communion*; and from the Inconsistence there is between *Diocesan*, and *Parish*, or *Congregational* Churches; and the Destructive Nature of the Diocesan Government, as 'tis framed to destroy *Congregational Churches*; from these Topicks, he brings those *Arguments*, by which he defends our *Nonconformity* to the Church of *England*, which he could never have done, were he not full well assured, that the *Nonconformists* ge-

nerally held Particular Churches to be *Congregational.* And,

§. 11. 7. That he was satisfied his Arguments were as much against *Classical*, as they were against *Diocesan* Churches, evidently appears by what he hath in his *Treatise* of *Episcopacy*, *Part* 1. C. 7. P. 120. when he saith, "That by a *Diocesan* "Church, We mean all the *Christians* "within that *Circuit*, who have but one "Bishop over them, tho' they be of MANY PARISH CHURCHES, yea FEW PRESBYTERIANS take the Word so Narrow "as this. For, (I think) too *many of them* "do with *Rutherford* Distinguish between "a *Worshipping Church*, and a *Governing* "*Church*, (and SADLING THE HORSE FOR "PRELACY TO MOUNT ON) do Affirm, "that many (about Twelve usually) of "these *Worshiping* Churches, like our Parishes) may make but one *Governed*, or "*Presbyterial* Church.

§. 12. What more *directly* belongs to the *Government* of the Church, we shall consider, if God will, elsewhere; and will only Note in this place, That whoever will consult Mr. *Baxter's Treatise* of *Episcopacy*, and what he saith of the *Ministry* and

and *Diſcipline* of Chriſt's Inſtituted Churches, will find that the *Engliſh Presbyterians*, whom he deſcribes, were as much againſt the *Claſſical Presbytery*, as the *Congregationaliſts* are. We will in the next propoſe the Sentiments of thoſe *Engliſh Presbyterians*, who entered into an Union with their *Congregational Brethren*.

SECT. V.

The Difference *between the* Claſſical Presbyterian, *and the* Congregationaliſt *ſtated. The* Deſign *of the* late Union, *and the* Principles, *upon which 'twas founded, conſiſtent with the* Eſtabliſhed National Church Form, *and ſuch as Juſtifie the* Separation *of the* Firſt Reformers *from* Rome. *The Claſſical Model Deſtructive of them, and therefore Rejected.*

§. 1. THAT it may be the more eaſily underſtood what *Principles* the *Presbyterians*, who were Men of Senſe and Integrity, muſt be ſuppoſed to be of, when they *United* with their *Congregational Brethren*; I will give an Impartial State of the Controverſie about the *Nature* and *Power* of Inſtituted Churches, as diſcuſs'd by them, who were for the *Claſſical*

Church Government, and by the *Independents forty* or *fifty* Years ago.

§. 2. This *Controverſie*, as to that part of it which concerns my preſent Purpoſe, may be reduced to theſe Heads.

1. Whether there be a *Catholick-Viſible-Political-Church?*

2. Whether there be a *Particular Church Eſſential Unorganiz'd*, veſted *with a Power to chooſe their own Officers?* Or, *An Eccleſia Inſtituta ſit Genus? An Integrum?*

§. 3. In the Writings of *Cawdrey*, *Hudſon*, *Hooker*, *Stone*, *Allen*, *Sheppard*, and the Diſſenting Brethren of the *Weſtminſter* Aſſembly, there being an Impartial State of this Controverſie, I will, out of their Writings, ſet it in as clear a Light as I can.

§. 4. 1. The Learned Mr. *Cawdrey*, who agreeth in Opinion with the Judicious Mr. *Hudſon*, and the *London* Miniſters in their *Jus Divinum*, doth, in his *Vindiciæ Vindiciarum*, and *Review* of Mr. *Hooker*'s *Survey*, declare not only for a *Viſible Catholick Church*, but "That this *Viſible Ca-*
"*tholick Church* may, in a fair and candid
"Senſe, be ſaid to be POLITICAL, and
"that

" that the Notion of CHURCH-ESSENTIAL,
" or HOMOGENOUS, is but the *Modus*, or
" State of a Church, applicable both to
" the whole Church, and every compleat
" Congregation, consisting of *Visible Saints*
" and *Officers*——But, it is not possible
" there should be an *Essential-Church* exi-
" sting without *Officers*——If we would
" speak exactly, neither a *Classis* of Offi-
" cers Assembled, nor a Company of Visi-
" ble Saints combined, can *properly* be cal-
" led a *Church*. They [*viz.* the *Indepen-*
" *dents*,] deny a *Classis* of Officers to be a
" Church; and *We* [who are for *Classes*,]
" deny a Company of Saints, combined
" without *Officers* to be a *Church*, being
" both of them but PARTS of a Church;
" part of the *Matter* of a Church, and
" therefore PROPERLY no Church. The
" Truth is, tho' both a *Classis*, and a Com-
" pany of Saints combined without Offi-
" cers, have by Custom, obtained to be
" called Churches, yet PROPERLY
" they are but *Parts* or *Members* of the
" whole Church diversly combined——But
" we add, If we will speak exactly, a
" Particular Congregation consisting of
" *Officers* and *Members*, is not PROPERLY
" a *Church*, but a Member of the *Catho-*
" *lick Visible* POLITICAL *Church*——And,

" if they, much more some *Members* of
" that *Member*; Visible Saints, without
" Officers, are *Improperly* called a Church
" ——Again, here lies one of the great
" Mistakes in the *Independent* way, That
" *they imagine a Church without, and before*
" *any Officers*, and then give them Power
" to make *Officers*.——So far the Learned
" Mr. *Cawdrey*.

§. 5. 2. The Judicious Mr. *Hudson*, states the Controversie after the same manner, but more elaborately, and with greater Logical Exactness, and expressly affirms the *Catholick Church* Visible to be a *Totum Integrale*, or POLITICAL Society; to be a *Corporation*, or Body Politick, in which there is a *Governing*, and *Governed Part*. And on the Supposition, that the Catholick Church Visible is a *Totum Integrale*, 'twill unavoidably follow, as Learned Mr. *Calamy* hath happily expressed it in his *Preface* to Mr. *Hudson*, that the *Congregational Government* is not right. " The
" Truth is (saith he) the Position there
" held forth, would utterly overthrow
" the *Grounds* and *Pillars* of the Congre-
" gational Government; for if there be a
" Catholick Church Visible, and this
" Church be not only a *Church Entitive*,
but

" but a *Church Organical*, and a *Totum In-*
" *tegrale*, having all Church Powers *habi-*
" *tually* seated in the *Officers* of it, which
" they have Commissions from Christ to
" Exert, and put into Act upon a Lawful
" Call; and if particular Congregations
" are *Integral* Parts and Members of the
" *Church Catholick*, as the *Jewish* Syna-
" gogues were of the *Jewish* Church; and
" if the *Ministry*, Orders, and Censures were
" given by Christ, *first* to the Church Ge-
" neral Visible, and *secondarily* to the
" Church Particular, then 'twill follow,
" that the particular Congregation is not
" the *First Receptacle* of Church *Power*;
" and that all Church Power is not *Entire-*
" *ly* and *Independently* in a particular Con-
" gregation. So far Mr. *Calamy*, to whom
I add, That according to this Notion, Vi-
sible Saints combined for Church Commu-
nion without Officers, are not a *Church*
Essential, and *have not a Power* to choose
Officers, *&c.* For upon this Principle, it's
manifest, yea 'tis owned, That to the Ca-
tholick Church Visible, which is a *Totum*
Integrale, or an *Organized Body*, a POLI-
TICAL Church, the *Administration* and
Immediate Participation of Government,
and all other Ordinances are firstly and
immediately given; yea further, it must
be

be granted, that particular Churches, whether *Congregational* or *Classical*, *Provincial* or *National*, are not *Properly* Churches, but *Integral Parts* of the Catholick Visible POLITICAL Church; that whoever is a Visible Christian, has an Immediate Right to all Ordinances; and that the Relation of every *Minister* is *firstly* and *habitually* unto the Catholick Church Visible, and *secondarily* to this or that *Particular* Church, which is not *Properly* a Church; that where-ever any single *Christian* comes, he is a Member of the Particular Church in that Place, and has a Right to all Ordinances, tho he never joyn'd himself to any; and whoever is ordained, he is a Pastor of the Catholick Church, may Administer all Ordinances, whither soever he comes, and Excommunicate Delinquents. Tho', for *Order sake*, his Power is not exercised, yet the Power remains *Entire* in every Ordained Minister, even in them who are called to take the Charge of any particular Church.

§. 6. 1. On the other hand, the *First Reformers* of all Perswasions subverted this *Notion* in their Opposition unto the *Papists*, by denying such a thing as a Visible Catholick Church, *Sublato Fundamento tollitur*

tur opus. And they who now own, that the many Visible *Christians*, scattered through the World, may be called the *Catholick Church Visible*, yet do strenuously oppugn its being a *Political* Church. And these Congregationalists affirm the Church Catholick Visible to be *Totum Universale, Genericum*, or as they sometimes express it, a *Totum Essentiale*; that this *Totum Generic*um gives *Essence* unto its *Species*, or Parts, and is its Cause, and in order of Nature before its *Species*, as a *Cause is before its Effects*, But then it must, (to prevent mistake) be carefully observ'd, that by [Church Universal Visible] they mean a Congregational, or a Particular *Church Essential*, which including the *General Nature* of a Church, they call *General* or *Universal*; but such as hath (where the Combination is) its *Essentials* existent, antecedently to the Consideration of its being an *Integrum*, or a *Body Politick*, and as such is dressed with a *Power* of *choosing* its Officers, and of becoming thereby a *Totum Integrale*, or an *Organick* Body.

§. 7. 2. *Fit Matter* Combined, before formed into an *Organick Body*, is, (with them) the *Church Essential*; the only immediate

mediate Seat of Church Power; or, to expreſs it in the Words of Mr. *Allen* and Mr. *Sheppard*, (*Def. of the Nine Propoſit.* P. 88.) " The true *Form* of all Church " Societies, Inſtituted by Chriſt, to which " he hath given the actual Adminiſtrati- " on, and Immediate Participation of " Church Government, and all other In- " ſtituted Ordinances, as the *Subject* there- " of, is *Congregational.*

§. 8. Theſe two Reverend Brethren do not, (I confeſs) think themſelves obliged to encumber this Controverſie with thoſe *Logical Niceties* of a *Totum Genericum*, a *Totum Integrale*, yet do they hold, " That " the *true State* of this Controverſie lies " here, concerning the NATURE, ORDER, " and FORM of ſuch Viſible Societies, as " Chriſt Jeſus, by Divine Inſtitution in " the Goſpel, hath reduced his Viſible " Members unto, for the Actual and *Im-* " *mediate* Injoyment of all his Inſtituted " Ordinances. And the Chain of their Principles lies thus.

Firſt, There is a Particular Church *Eſſential*, which is *Congregational*; this Congregation is made up of Viſible Saints, who upon their Mutual Conſent and Agreement to walk together according to Goſpel

Gospel Rule, have an Immediate Right to *Stated* Communion in all the Special Ordinances of the Gospel; that as they have Power to Combine together, as aforesaid, so being combined, they have a Power of choosing their own *Officers*, as being furnished with such, have received Authority from Jesus Christ to Exercise Government, and of enjoying all Ordinances of Worship within themselves.

§. 9. These then are the Points wherein Mr. *Cawdrey*, *Hudson*, and others, who were for the *Classical* Churches and Government, differed from the old *Nonconformists*, and the *English Presbyterian* and *Congregationalist*. For, the *Ecclesiastical Presbyterians* held the Catholick Church Visible to be a *Body Politick*; the *first Seat* of all Ordinances, and that the Pastor's Office was with Relation to the whole Catholick Church; that they might Administer all Ordinances of Worship and Discipline wheresoever they came. The Congregational *Presbyterian*, in opposition unto 'em, denied the Catholick Church Visible to be a *Body Politick*, or *Governed Society*, that Visible Saints combin'd for Communion in all Ordinances, *whilst without Officers*, were a particular Church *Essential*;

ſential; that theſe Churches had *Power to chooſe their own Officers*; and that the *Ruling Power* of theſe *Officers* was confined within the Bounds of *Congregational Particular Churches.*

§. 10. Well then let us in the next place compare theſe diſtinct Notions with the late *Heads* of *Agreement*, and ſee whether the *United Brethren* fell in with the *Engliſh Presbyterian* Principles in this *Matter*, or not?

§. 11. 1. If we do but impartially obſerve the *Deſign* of this *Agreement*, we ſhall find it to be nothing elſe than an *Improvement* of our *Liberty*, in ſuch a way as may moſt *effectually convince* them of the *Church* of *England*, that nothing is more *Remote* from our Thoughts, than a making the leaſt Incroachment upon, or in any wiſe an Intermedling with the *National Church Form*; and whereas the Congregational and *Engliſh Presbyterian* Principles are beſt adjuſted to this end, as well as moſt *Conform* to the Goſpel Rule, we took ſpecial care in drawing up the *Agreement*, to Aſſert, and Explain their Principles. And therefore, as we did in the *Preface*, and in the *Title* of the firſt Page,

Page, positively declare against *Intermedling* with the *National Church Form*: So,

§. 12. 2. We did express our *Dislike* of that Principle, on which either a *Diocesan*, or *Classical* Church *Government*, is erected: For by the *first Article* in the *first Section*, the *Catholick* Churches being a *Totum Integrale*, a Society under an External *Polity* or *Government*, is *Disclaimed* in these Words, *viz.* "But as for the Notion of a Visible Catholick Church, as "it may signifie its having been collected "into any *Formed Society*, under a *Visible* "*Head* on Earth; whether *one Person singly*, or many *collectively*, we, with the "rest of *Protestants*, do UNANIMOUSLY "DISCLAIM IT.

§. 13. 3. Agreeably hereunto, a particular Church ESSENTIAL, with its *Rights* and Liberties, is *Asserted*, and *Described*, first more generally, *Art.* 2. "We Agree, "that particular Societies of Visible Saints, "who under Christ their Head are *stated-*"*ly* joyn'd together for ORDINARY COM-"MUNION *with one another* in ALL THE "*Ordinances* of Christ, are *Particular* "*Churches*. That is to say, a Congregation of Visible Saints, *statedly* joyn'd together

ther for these Ends. So that here is a Particular Church Essential asserted, that this particular Church *Essential* is Congregational also cleared, and *as such* agreed unto; for it's said, that they are *statedly* joyn'd together for ORDINARY *Communion with one another*, in *all the Ordinances of Christ*, *which cannot* be but in *one single Congregation*. But,

§. 14. 4. There is special care taken to secure this Principle by declaring in the *second Article*, *That these Societies are to be owned by each other for Instituted Churches of Christ*, than which nothing can be more plainly delivered, in opposition to the *Classical* Government.

§. 15. 5. This particular Congregational Church *Essential*, is more particularly described as to its *Matter* and *Form*, *Art.* 3. and 4. Besides,

§. 16. The *Right* of this Church *Essential* to choose its own Officers, is secured by *Art.* 6. "That each Particular Church "hath *Right* to *choose their own Officers*, and "being furnished with such as are duly "Qualified and Ordained according to "Gospel Rule, HATH AUTHORITY *from Jesus*

" *Jesus Christ*, for EXERCISING GOVERN-
" MENT, and of *Enjoying* ALL *the Ordi-*
" *nances of Worship* WITHIN IT SELF.
This then being the Turning Point between *those* who are for a *Catholick Church Government*, and *these*, who are for a Particular Congregational Government; I will be the more distinct in showing what depends on a Right, or wrong stating it.

§. 17. 1. If this *Article* contains *not* the *Truth*, then indeed the Cause must be yielded to the *Classical*, *Diocesan*, *Provincial*, *National*, *Patriarchal*, *and Papal Church Government*. For, upon the same *Reason* the Government is stretched beyond a single Congregational, to a *Classical* Church, it must be carried to the outmost Bounds of the *Catholick*, which is the *Papal*: For it is impossible to carry it to a *Classical*, or *Diocesan*, upon any other Reason, than as it is a *Larger part* of the Catholick Church Polity, which still must pay a Deference unto a Larger, until you come to a larger than that, and at last to the *Largest* of all, *viz.* the *Papal*; which is a Truth that hath been so fully cleared by Mr. *Baxter*, and is in its own Nature so very *Plain* and Obvious, that

a small Measure of Attention will help an ordinary Capacity to see into it.

§. 18. 2. But, if this Article, of the *United Brethren* DOTH contain the *Truth*, and a particular *Church Essential* hath Power to choose its own Officers; and being furnished with such, hath received Authority from Christ to exercise *Government*, and enjoy all *Ordinances of* Worship *within it self*, then it unavoidably follows, that Congregational Churches are in a *Proper Sense* Particular Churches; that all Church Power doth *firstly* belong unto them; and that *Classical*, *Provincial*, *National*, *Patriarchal*, Churches are not *Properly Churches*, nor have they a Power over Particular Congregational Churches. Besides,

§. 19. 3. If the *United Brethren*, namely, the *English Presbyterian* and *Congregationalists*, do herein Assert no more than they are Authorized to do by the Gospel of our Lord Jesus, then the *First Reformers* in their *Separation from* ROME, *and* their setting up Churches of another sort, than what were established by the *Pope*, did no more than what they were empowered by *Jesus Christ* himself *to do*, as will

will clearly appear by an Impartial Proposal of the Judgment of the Learned *Gilbertus Voetius*, *Meinardus Shottanus*, and *Carolus de Maetz*, Divinity Professors at *Utrecht*, which upon such Mighty Considerations, as relate to the *Vitals* of the *Reformation* they gave, in the resolving some Cases proposed unto them, on the Forming that *Particular Church*, of which one Mr. *Park* was chosen *Pastor*, who hath said enough to justifie what the *United Brethren* have Asserted about a *Particular Church* ESSENTIAL, and the Power of chooſing her own Officers. Consider then that the Questions proposed were,

"1. Whether such *Faithful Persons*, as "without the Authority of any Ecclesiastical *Society*, either *Classical*, or *Presbyterial*, by *Combination* forming themselves into a *Society* for Communion, in the Ordinances of the Gospel, may be "*Acknowledged* to be ESSENTIALLY a *Church?*

"2. Whether *this Church* ESSENTIAL hath *Power* to choose a *Pastor?*

To the first they answer, "That it is, and may be said to be *Essentially* a *True Church of Christ*, [*Distinguenda est*, (say they) *Ecclesiæ Particularis* Essentia *ab* INTEGRITATE, *& Perfectione ejus*

" ORGANICA, *Voet. Pol. Eccleſ. Part.* 1. " *Lib.* 1. *Cap.* 3.] to wit, an *External*, *Vi-* " *ſible*, Inſtituted, Parochial, Particular " Church. Their *fourth Reaſon* for it is this. " If the contrary Opinion ſhould " be admitted, we cannot (ſay they) ſee " what may be the Conſequences thereof, " with reſpect to thoſe *Difficult Controver-* " *ſies* with the *Papiſts*, about the *Perpe-* " *tual Succeſſion* of the Churches ſome " Years before *Luther*, about their *Sepa-* " *ration* from *Rome*; about the firſt *Ga-* " *thering* and *Conſtituting* Reformed Chur- " ches; and *calling of Miniſters* before, " with, at, and ſince the Reforma- " tion.

§. 20. The Strength of what they offer on this Occaſion, lieth here; namely, in caſe Viſible Saints combin'd for Communion in the Ordinances of the Goſpel, have *Power*, by Virtue of Jeſus Chriſt's Inſtitution, to *call* and *chooſe their own Officers*: The firſt Reformers, in combining thus, and chooſing their own Officers, acted in purſuance of the *Authority* given 'em by Jeſus Chriſt, and are Juſtified. But had they not ſuch a *Power*, their Caſe is not eaſily defended. Theſe Great Divines therefore in Anſwer to the ſecond *Enquiry*, affirm

firm, *That a Church* Essential *has a Power belonging unto it, to call a Pastor.* So that these Learned Men, have urged Arguments sufficient to justifie what the *United Brethren* have done, in defining a Church *Essential*, and in shewing how it becomes an *Integral*, *Organical*, *Political* Body: And what they have urged from the Consideration of the Fatal Consequences of the contrary Doctrine, with respect to the *First Reformation*, hath enough in it to satisfie any considering Mind about the Reasons that have Influenced the *United Brethren*, to fix their Foot on this Principle about a Particular Church *Essential*, in the framing the Heads of their Agreement. Once more,

§. 21. As the *United Brethren* have Asserted Particular Churches to be *Congregational*, so it's evident, they have *confined the Power of their Officers to their* own Churches: For in the *Section* of *Communion* with *other* Churches, *Art.* 2. it is agreed, " That none of our Particular " Churches shall be *Subordinate* to one a- " nother; each being endow'd with *Equa-* " *lity of Power* from Jesus Christ; and " that none of the said *Particular* Chur- " ches, their *Officer*, or *Officers*, shall *Ex-*

" *erciſe* any *Power*, or have *any Superiority* " over any *other Church*, or *their Officers*. So clear it is, that this *Article*, by denying unto *one Officer* ſingly, and to *many Officers collectively*, any ſort of Power, or Superiority over one another, doth lay an impregnable Bar againſt the ſetting up of *Claſſical*, *Provincial*, or *National* Aſſemblies, inveſted with a Power to govern Congregational Churches. For, it muſt be acknowledged, that in forming the late *Heads* of *Agreement*, ſpecial care was taken to convince them of the Church of *England*, that there was no place for us to make the leaſt Incroachments on the Eſtabliſhed National Church Form; That the *Mounds* and Barriers we raiſed to keep all within the Confines of the *Tolleration* granted us, were ſuch, that no ſincere Approver of the *Union*, can have any Hand in erecting any thing like a National Church Form; and therefore can never be for Claſſical, Provincial or National Aſſemblies of Miniſters: Their going about any ſuch thing, is a breaking down the ſtrongeſt Mounds, a violating the moſt Solemn Engagements, and a tearing up the very Foundation, on which the late Union was built, which can never be anſwered to our Countrey Brethren, nor to their own

own Conſciences, much leſs unto a Holy and Jealous God. For,

§. 22. By the *Heads* of *Agreement*, *as* all that Church Power we claim is confined to Particular Congregational Churches, and a Superiority of Power denied to any one Officer or Officers of Churches; ſo *Particular Churches* were no further concern'd to give any account of their own Actings, beſide what the *Civil Magiſtrate* requires, but what on ſome ſpecial Occaſions might be needful in a Brotherly way to Neighbour Congregations when deſired, and 'twas for the removal of Scandals, or the rectifying Miſtakes. But for *ſtated* Claſſical, Provincial, or Natural Aſſembles, and the coming under the Obligation of making a *Diligent Obſervation*, and a *Faithful Report* of the *State* of their Congregations, unto any of thoſe larger Aſſemblies, there is not one Word in our *Agreement*. Nor, can any of our Number conſent that our Miniſters ſhould take upon 'em the Office of ſtated *Inquiſitors*, or *Informers*: For, as ſuch an *Imploy* is as likely to *Ruine*, as it is to ſerve its chiefeſt Contrivers, ſo it's *Unworthy* of *Men*, in ſo Holy a Function, and contrary to that Work, Chriſt Jeſus has called his Miniſters

ſters unto; which, lying in ſtrenuous Endeavours to further the Salvation of them committed to their care, cannot be faithfully performed, but by keeping within the *Pale* of their *Single Congregations*. And ſeeing this is what is granted to us by the *Toleration*, to which we have hitherto *confined* our ſelves, we declare it to be our *Firm Reſolution*, always to do ſo; being as much *Diſſatisfied* with that *Church-Form*, which endangers the Eſtabliſhed Church, as any in that Church can be. For,

§. 23. That very *Form* of Church Government, which alone can give juſt Ground of Suſpicion, is as *Deſtructive* of thoſe Churches we believe to be of *Divine Inſtitution*, as it can be of the Eſtabliſhed Church *Form*. The *Jure Divino Claſſical Government*, that *Rivals* it with the *Epiſcopal*, doth as really deſtroy *Congregational Churches*, by making them but *Parts* of a *Proper Church*, as it would ſubvert the *Dioceſan*, were it ſet up amongſt us. Yea, if we more cloſely look into this Matter, we ſhall find the *Claſſical* Government more *Hurtful* to our Church way, than it can be to *theirs*, ſeeing it allows of *Dioceſan*, under the Name of *Claſſical*,

ſical, and ſtrikes only at their *Rulers*, and not at their *Church-ſtate*, whilſt it *Unchurches* all our *Congregations*, and Diveſts the *Officers* of that Power, which we think Chriſt has given them; and are therefore more *Formidable* unto, and *Dreaded* by *us*, than by the Church it ſelf; which Conſideration will, we hope, ſatisfie our *Superiours*, and every thoughtful Perſon of the Church, That they are in *no Danger from us*.

§. 24. That they deſtroy our Church way, is farther evident, in that they bring every *Paroch* and *Congregation* under the Government of their *Claſſical*, and other Larger *Aſſemblies*, by the Obligation of a *Divine Law*; and that they may to their own greater Satisfaction, prove thus much, they make the *Catholick Church Viſible* to be *one Govern'd Society*, or *Body Politick*, which muſt neceſſarily be under a *Governed Head*, either of *One ſingle Perſon*, or of many *Collectively*; whereby they run ſo far, as to deſtroy not only *Congregational Churches*, but to ſubvert that very *Principle*, upon which the *Reformation* was begun in this *Land*, and do lay a Foundation for that *Papal Anti-chriſtian* Power, which in

in its *Exerciſe*, hath ſhed the Blood of Thouſands, who are now under the *Altar*, crying, *How long* Holy *and* True *doſt thou not Avenge*, &c. and againſt which, we have, by the *Oath of Supremacy* Sworn: So that tho' we agree with our *Claſſical Brethren* of *Scotland*, in affirming *Biſhops* and *Presbyters* to be *of the ſame Order*, (which only is againſt the *Divine*, not REGAL *Right* of *Epiſcopacy*) and do greatly Honour them for their Zeal againſt *Superſtition*, and *Profaneneſs*, and for their *Soundneſs* in the *Faith*; yet muſt declare, in the Words of Mr. *Baxter*, [in his *Diſcourſe* againſt the *Revolt* to a *Foreign Juriſdiction*, which would be to *England*, its PERJURY, CHURCH-RUINE, *and* SLAVERY, *Pag.* 365.] *That we are Diſpleaſed with thoſe* Scots, *that have cauſeleſly Quarrell'd with the* Oath of Supremacy, *and* So HELPT TO *Open a Door to a* FOREIGN JURISDICTION, *which the Kingdom is Sworn againſt.* And therefore we cannot, in Conſcience, have any Hand in ſetting it up in this Nation. However we muſt do 'em ſo much Juſtice as to add,

§. 25.

§. 25. That we are fully perſwaded, their Soundneſs in the *Faith* is ſuch, that they will never approve of the late *Claſſical Project*, as 'tis deſigned by ſome of its *Contrivers*. The true Faith hath obtain'd ſo great an Intereſt in their Hearts, that they'll never be wheedled to joyn in the ſame *Comprehenſion* with either *Quaker*, or *Unitarian*, tho' they pretend a *Zeal* for the *Claſſical Government*. If then the late *Projectors* propoſe their *Model* with an Expectation to *decoy* our *Scotch* Brethren into a Complyance with it, they will find themſelves, I doubt not, to have greatly failed in their *Politicks*; ſeeing, in the Iſſue, their *Project* cannot but appear to be as *vain*, as the *Unitarians* threatning the *Church of England* to be for the *Claſſical way*, is *Ridiculous*, which yet they have done, as may be ſeen in their *Agreement* with the *Catholick Church*, P. 13. where it's thus: "I "wiſh the Church had not given, and "may never give cauſe to the *Unita-* "*rians*, either by *Excluſion*, or *Perſecution*, "to have Recourſe to Mr. *Calvin*'s Expe- "dient.

§. 26.

§. 26. I might here take notice by whom this *Classical* Model was hatch'd, and how it was nourish'd under the Encouragement and Warrant of a late State-Minister, and was, in its first Projection to be of the same Extent and Comprehension with the *Friendly Society*, that there might be a more easie Coalescence, when it should be most for the Advantage of those that were at the Head of it. But to be over nice in the Enquiry, were to make the thing it self *now* too considerable. For whatever might have been expected from so hopeful a Design, whilst it was to be carried on with all possible *Privacy*, it has the Misfortune, like some *Medicines*, and *Perfumes*, to lose both its Virtue and Savour too, by being exposed to the open Air. But, if we consider it in the first Contrivance, it would be hard to give an Instance of a more Bold and Undigested Undertaking ever attempted by Thinking Men, which makes it the more surprizing to find a Statesman tampering with it, were it not that some Men delight in *Paradoxes*, of which of late Years, we have had not a few Instances; and how far it is from being one, to think either, that our Brethren

Brethren in *Scotland* could be prevail'd upon by these Gentlemen, or the Orthodox Church of *England* frighted with the Ghost of a *Classical* Government; I leave Wiser Men to judge.

To Conclude.

§. 27. When our Governours, in their great Wisdom, shall consider how strongly the Principles of the *English Presbyterians*, and *Congregationalists*, do Oblige 'em to confine themselves to *Matters meerly Spiritual*, in *their single Congregations*, how many Barriers are in pursuance of their Principles, set up against their Intermedling with the *National Church Form*; and that the very Government, from which alone they are in danger, if it should prevail, would at the same time destroy that Church Form, for which we plead, will be fully satisfied in that Security our Principles do give unto them. Nor can we think, that our Nobility and Gentry will be fond of a *Jure Divino* National Church Government of any sort, much less of the *Classical*;

Classical; which tho' it hath been in most Esteem amongst the *Presbyterian* Nobility and Gentry in *Scotland*, yet now is become too heavy a Yoak for them to bear; who therefore have lately discovered their disbelief of its *Divine Right*, by a *Legal* Establishment of several *Parochian Congregational Churches*, exempt from the *Classical* Government; which they would never have done, had they been of Opinion, that the Classical way was injoyned them by a *Divine Unalterable Law*; so that as the Divine Right of the *Classical Presbytery* could never be Established in *England*, in like manner it's not like to continue much longer in *Scotland*. And, considering the true State of Affairs Ecclesiastical, at this time, we have good Reason to hope, That as the *Divine Right* of any other National Church Government, never yet gained a Legal Settlement amongst us, so it never will; and that therefore we may, upon good Grounds, reckon our selves to be, in point of our *Liberty*, *Safe*: For, as our Principles won't suffer us to harm the Church; so our *Legislators* will never bring themselves and *Posterity* into the Bondage of any

any *Jure Divino* National Church, upon which Account, and no other, can they think themſelves obliged to diſquiet *Peaceable Diſſenters.*

F I N I S.